

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0984/01 3310916
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
O 260916Z NOV 08
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2268
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L THE HAGUE 000984

SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS AND DENYER)
NSC FOR FLY
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: DECL: 11/26/2018

TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)

SUBJECT: CWC: SCENESETTER FOR THE CONFERENCE OF THE STATES
PARTIES (CSP-13) AND WRAP UP FOR NOVEMBER 17-21, 2008

REF: A. THE HAGUE 972

[1](#)B. THE HAGUE 978

[1](#)C. THE HAGUE 898

Classified By: Ambassador Eric M. Javits for reasons 1.4 (B) and (D)

This is CWC-58-08.

SUMMARY

[1](#)1. (U) Meetings continued apace in anticipation of the Conference of the States Parties (CSP), without any significant progress on the budget or other CSP issues. The budget consultations remain in the same deadlock reached at the Executive Council (EC) in October, with the key difference remaining on the number of inspections of Other Chemical Production Facilities (OCPF). The facilitators for Articles VII and XI held consultations and prepared draft texts for the CSP, but Iran continued to obstruct any agreement on either.

[1](#)2. (C) Delreps met with a delegation from Taiwan on November 18, and followed up on the application of the Taiwan Chemical Industry Association to observe the CSP with the Secretary of the Policy Making Organs on November 21. Delreps also met with the DCM from the Israeli Embassy, who requested a meeting with the U.S. delegation at the CSP for his visiting delegation attending as observers. Two Clingendael representatives met with Amb. Javits to discuss "The Hague Process."

[1](#)3. (SBU) The visiting VCI team led by Lisa Von Colln and Delrep met with the Technical Secretariat (TS) officials responsible for the development and implementation of the Verification Information System (VIS) and the Electronic Declarations Tool for National Authorities (EDNA) on November 18. U.S. experts with the OPCW Data Validation Group gave the delegation a read-out of their meetings on November 19, and a read-out of the Scientific Advisory Board's Sampling and Analysis Working Group meeting on November 21.

¶4. (SBU) The Japanese delegation hosted a meeting of the G8/Global Partnership group on November 18, which was reported separately in Ref B.

SCENESETTER FOR THE CSP

¶5. (SBU) The Conference of the States Parties is notable this year for the lack of substance on its agenda. Had the 2009 Budget been approved by EC-54 in October, the CSP would be a very routine meeting indeed. The budget battle will form the major backdrop for the meeting, but it will likely happen in smaller meetings and a last-minute EC to pass it before the Conference ends. There are draft decisions circulating for Article VII implementation and for Article XI, but unlike last year, the European Union does not need an Article VII decision this time, and the Western Group in general is lukewarm to antagonistic toward further action on Article XI. At best, report language or decisions are likely to reflect earlier versions with no new initiatives.

¶6. (C) Iran, as always, is a wild card and has kept a pack of issues open for possible use. Article X is dormant, but Iran could resurrect their victims' network or even propose something new; the Article X facilitator deliberately has not held consultations since the EC. On Article XI, the Iranian delegate

has stated in consultations that Tehran wants a "stronger" decision, but without providing details. The Iranians have opposed a decision on Article VII in consultations, while many Western countries feel that some Article VII implementation balance may be needed against any decision on Article XI.

¶7. (C) Iran's fixation on the U.S. missing the final destruction deadline could be given new life with recent press reports on new delays. Del has not yet received any questions on the recent publication of the Selected Acquisition Report for the chem demil program (specifically the "beginning of operations" shifting to as late as 2021 for one of the ACWA sites). However, destruction delays tend to be picked up by delegations only too happy to comb the press for information on the U.S. program, and the issue still has the potential to influence the CSP. Although the only destruction-specific document on the agenda, the DG's annual report to the Conference on progress made in meeting extended deadlines, is of no real significance in terms of approval, Iran or others could use the agenda item as a logical place for harmful report language on U.S. delays, or insistence upon the provision of operational dates for the ACWA facilities, etc.

MEETING WITH TAIWAN DELEGATION

¶8. (C) On November 18, Delreps met with Dr. I. Yuan (Institute of International Relations, National Chengchi University, Taiwan) and Dr. Larry Shyu (Industrial Technology Research Institute, Taiwan)) as well as two representatives from the Taipei Office in The Netherlands, Dr. Thomas Tung and Jennifer Hsieh. The meeting took place in a private room in a local restaurant.

¶9. (C) The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the application of the Taiwan Chemical Industry Association (TCIA) to attend CSP-13 as an observer. The Taiwan Office has submitted applications in the past but claim to have never received an

acknowledgement or response. Yuan felt that with the establishment of the new government in Taiwan, and the public announcement soon thereafter that Taiwan (ROC) will uphold UNSCR 1540 and continue to abide by the conventions of the CWC, and in view of the new economic cooperation agreements recently signed with China (PRC), the application might receive more serious consideration.

¶10. (C) Shyu pointed out that Taiwan's chemical production ranks ninth in the world. Following the CWC's ban on trade in Schedule 2 chemicals with non States Parties, Taiwan no longer imports those chemicals. However, Taiwan imports Schedule 3 chemicals with a total value of over USD 13 million from various countries (including 53.7 percent from China) for which it submits End User Certificates. Shyu expressed great concern that a ban on Schedule 3 chemicals might come into effect which would severely affect Taiwan's industry and exports. Delreps stated that any change in Schedule 3 transfers was unlikely.

¶11. (C) Delrep asked what degree of dialogue exists between the chemical associations of PRC and ROC and between the chemical associations of PRC and ROC and how the warming of cross-strait relations might affect them. Tung said that industry based dialogue exists, in addition to frequent exchanges of scholars and trade. However, there is no official government acknowledgement that such exchanges exist. End-user agreements are supplied to China by the company, not the government. Both sides are eager to speed up regularization of trade but the push to move ahead is driven by economics and functionality.

¶12. (SBU) Delrep suggested that the representatives contact Michael Luhan (Head, OPCW Media and Public Affairs Branch) to ensure that their application has been received. Delrep described how the CSP's General Committee would review such applications at the start of the CSP and that member states could block applications (and have done so in the past). She noted that the delegation had instructions from Washington to be sure the General Committee reviewed the TCIA application.

¶13. (SBU) Del note: Delrep later contacted Luhan, who confirmed that he had received TCIA's application for observer status and had forwarded it -- along with all other observer applications -- to the Protocol Branch. Luhan also shared that, in keeping with past practice, he had prepared two versions for consideration by the General Committee of the draft decision to approve observers, one including and the other excluding TCIA.

MEETING WITH SECRETARY TO THE POLICY MAKING ORGANS
REGARDING TAIWAN'S APPLICATION

¶14. (SBU) Delreps met with Secretary to the Policy Making Organs Alexander Khodakov on November 21 to discuss the Taiwanese application. Khodakov was aware of the application. Procedurally, he said, the application would be reviewed just before the opening of CSP-13 by the current General Committee, still in place from CSP-12. Their recommendation will be immediately conveyed to the new General Committee for CSP-13 and the decision circulated in the Conference.

¶15. (C) Khodakov expressed little optimism that the application would receive a positive response from China. He could not confirm if a formal denial of participation is normally sent out. He said this would be the job of the Protocol Branch. Khodakov

asked for a copy of the Taiwan application and indicated that he would follow up.

ISRAEL AT THE CSP

¶16. (C) Israeli DCM Yair Even called on Delreps November 20 for an update on issues at the CSP and to request a meeting with the Israeli delegation on December 3. Representatives from the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Defense will be attending the CSP as observers. He also said that the Director-General had written a letter to his government requesting to have an OPCW delegation, led by the Legal Advisor, visit. Even was skeptical of reports that Lebanon would soon join the Chemical Weapons Convention, but said it would be a positive change if Lebanon and Iraq accede in the coming months.

WEOG

¶17. (SBU) On November 17, Amb. Werner Burkart (Germany) chaired the weekly WEOG meeting. He started discussion with a re-cap of the previous week's Industry Cluster consultations, noting that delegations stated their opening positions on low concentrations and enhanced OCPF declarations, showing varying levels of flexibility. Facilitator for low concentrations Giuseppe Cornacchia (Italy) said that his consultation went as expected, characterizing it as a good start. He noted that he Qcharacterizing it as a good start. He noted that he

has been conducting bilateral consultations to sound out delegations and will continue to do so until his next consultation after the new year.

¶18. (SBU) Turning to Article VII, Burkart described Iran's complete obstruction during the previous consultation as verging on silliness. Cornacchia shared that he had spoken with Article VII facilitator Said Moussi (Algeria), who feels that he has done his job by proposing draft text on the issue and thinks that delegations are responsible for moving forward. Delrep highlighted Russia's useful interventions during the consultations, including the linking of Article XI assistance with meeting Article VII obligations.

¶19. (SBU) Budget facilitator Martin Strub (Switzerland) reported that there were no new developments on the budget since EC-54 and said that he hoped to focus on the main point of contention -- the number of inspections of Other Chemical Production Facilities (OCPFs) -- without opening up the entire budget. Strub also noted his intention to finalize discussion on the Medium-term Plan and to have the TS address lingering questions on its ability to absorb the projected EUR 1.9 million increase in staff costs mandated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). Strub confirmed that the Director-General (DG) will not modify his proposal for ten additional OCPF inspections, so any compromise would have to come from delegations or through the facilitator.

¶20. (SBU) Under Any Other Business, Burkart reported that GRULAC (Latin America and Caribbean Group) had chosen its nominees for positions to be elected during the CSP: Costa Rica and Ecuador for CSP vice-chairs; Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Uruguay for the EC; Argentina and Bolivia for the Credentials Committee; and Cuba and Peru for the Confidentiality Commission. Burkart also raised the EC Bureau

meeting scheduled for November 21 and noted that Iranian delegate Mohsen Naziri Asl had been invited to attend despite objections that Iran's position as vice-chair had been specific to the Iranian ambassador -- who departed during the summer -- and should not be filled by a delegate. Burkart said that he will raise the issue during the meeting and will also seek an opinion from Legal Advisor Santiago Onate.

BUDGET

¶21. (U) On November 17, budget facilitator Martin Strub (Switzerland) convened the first consultation since EC-54 failed to reach agreement on the draft Program of Work and Budget for 2009. Strub said that the main open question is the number of OCPF inspections; he noted that the DG's proposal remains at 128 (ten more inspections than in 2008). He also said that the TS's October 8 proposed reallocation of resources was no longer under consideration, having basically been rejected during EC-54. So, Strub said that his starting point is the draft budget reduced by approximately EUR 531,000, making a total budget level of approximately EUR 74.5 million with assessments reduced by 0.2% from 2008.

¶22. (U) China stated that its position remains firm
Q22. (U) China stated that its position remains firm that OCPF inspections should not be increased given that more time is needed to assess recent changes to site selection methodology and proposed changes to OCPF declarations. India also reiterated its position that OCPFs pose less risk than scheduled chemical facilities according to the CWC and that the budget should not be used to force policy changes.

Iran chimed in, stating that there is no basis for increasing OCPF inspections while outstanding issues remain unresolved. Other Non-aligned Movement (NAM) delegations -- including Pakistan, Algeria and South Africa -- stated similar positions.

¶23. (U) Iran went on say that discussion on the budget should not be limited to the number of OCPF inspections, noting concerns about some key performance indicators (KPIs) and staffing, particularly in the Office of Special Projects (OSP). Iran also noted it would not be able to "receive" the Medium-term Plan until some objectionable language (i.e., "non-proliferation") is changed.

¶24. (U) Strub commented that all other delegations had indicated their ability to "note" the Medium-term Plan, as amended, and reminded Iran that the document is not open for editing but reflects the opinion of the DG and the TS. Strub also said that previous consultations had gone through each section of the budget and that he understood KPIs and programmatic details had been revised to make them all acceptable.

¶25. (U) Ireland made the initial response to the NAM opposition, countering that ten additional OCPF inspections would not be enough to address the real concern with a lack of inspections, but that Ireland was willing to accept the DG's judgment. Other WEOG delegations and Japan echoed Ireland's comments.

¶26. (U) The meeting with Strub calling on all delegations to be flexible but no apparent shift in positions.

¶27. (U) On November 24, Strub convened another budget consultation, this time with TS attendance. The DG made an impassioned admonition to delegations to come

to agreement quickly, preferably during the November 27 special EC meeting. He reminded EC member states of their obligation to respect the role of the CSP and not to marginalize its authority. The DG also defended his decision to increase OCPF inspections by ten, saying that the number balanced the need to enforce the CWC with the TS's ability to carry out inspections. Conceding that the ultimate decision will be a political one, the DG stressed that he has no other number to propose and that from a technical perspective, he and the TS believe that OCPF inspections must increase. He also noted that increased OCPF inspections in no way signals a shift in focus, stressing that destruction remains the priority and accounts for 85% of all inspection and verification activity.

ARTICLE XI

¶28. (U) Li Hong (China) convened an Article XI consultation on November 19 to continue discussions surrounding the proposed workshop and recommendations for the upcoming CSP. Li circulated a draft decision that he had prepared in consultation with the TS, and asked that delegations be prepared to discuss the draft at the next consultation. Iran asserted that this draft did not necessarily represent the only draft, implying that it might produce its own version for consideration.

¶29. (U) The Iranian delegate made several impassioned interventions and revealed that its delegation is under instructions from Tehran to pursue a strengthened decision beyond that reached during CSP-¶10. He called for intensified discussions on Article XI that would lead to a substantive decision. He also argued that any decision should not include references to the proposed workshop while the details are still yet to be worked out.

¶30. (U) Li responded that the workshop should remain in any decision so that the language would accurately reflect progress made over the past year in consultations. The UK delegate expressed disappointment should the workshop be left out. Cuba did not commit to either a decision or report language but insisted that the upcoming CSP should result in a clear mandate on how to move forward on this article, implying that a decision would best achieve this goal.

¶31. (U) Regarding the workshop, Li conceded his failure in gaining consensus on how to proceed and therefore recommended returning to the updated Cuban proposal. Li suggested the TS use the Cuban proposal as a basis from which to draw up plans for the workshop, that would then be forwarded to delegations for consideration. (Del Comment: Li was clearly frustrated and seemed pleased to conveniently punt the task of planning the work shop to the TS, especially as his tenure as Article XI Facilitator is fast coming to an end with his expected departure from The Hague next month.)

¶32. (U) Most delegations supported this approach (U.S., China, Japan, South Africa, Algeria, and Italy). Cuba reminded delegations about other papers submitted on the workshop, i.e. the Iranian paper circulated during the last Executive Council (EC), and urged the group to adhere to EC-54 language and finish the task of planning the workshop. To that end, Cuba contended that a decision, if agreed to, should reflect the outcome of discussions on the workshop.

¶33. (U) Iran stated that Tehran could not support tasking the planning of the workshop to the TS and expressed disappointment at the current direction of the consultation, threatening there could be "consequences" elsewhere. The Iranian delegate did not support leaving the workshop to the TS and insisted on discussing further, within the consultation, the substance and organization of the workshop. He then reminded delegations of Iran's own paper and asked why it has been ignored up until now. Finally, Iran stated that the workshop does not represent a concrete measure on implementation of Article XI but is only a forum for discussions; concrete measures are still needed to ensure full implementation of this article.

¶34. (U) South Africa then asked the TS for an update to the status of the requested compilation of all past documents related to Article XI. The TS responded that a list is now available containing 13 documents from 1994 until summer 2008, and that any of these specific documents would be available from the document center upon request. (Del comment: Several delegations noted later that this list is very selective and does not include early papers by Sweden, the U.S. and others. It seems to be an Iranian list without any additional research by the TS on historical papers related to Article XI.)

ARTICLE VII

¶35. (U) On November 20, Article VII facilitator Said Moussi (Algeria) chaired a meeting to advance discussions on his draft proposal for the upcoming CSP (reftel). Moussi announced that, after having met bilaterally with the Iranian delegation, they had formally agreed to use his proposal as a basis for further discussion. He also reminded delegations that the proposal's ultimate format (i.e., either a decision or report language) remained undecided.

¶36. (U) The consultation then turned into a paragraph-by-paragraph review of the draft proposal, starting with the title; Iran said the use of a title made the proposal look like a decision, prejudging discussions; South Africa and Mexico indicated a preference for the title used in previous decisions; and Germany commented that the new title is appropriate and fits the model used with other articles. Most debate on the preambulatory paragraphs centered around recognizing progress made in national implementation and further action still to be taken, with Ireland making a distinct linkage between the two relevant paragraphs. Delrep, France and Brazil called for a balance of the two. South Africa, Mexico and China all spoke in favor of noting the "considerable" progress made; Russia and Germany countered that, while there has been some progress, it has been neither steady nor considerable. Iran was very vocal in insisting on deleting any reference to work still needing to be done, saying that it undermined the proposal's positive tone.

¶37. (U) The main point of contention on the operative paragraphs was reference to the Second Review Conference (RevCon). South Africa called for caution in "enshrining" parts of the RevCon report in a decision, going on to say that language used in the RevCon report was part of a package and should not be quoted selectively. WEOG delegations retorted that it is normal practice to use "agreed language." Russia again called for including deadlines -- as in previous decisions -- for States Parties to

accomplish certain obligations. The Iranian delegate noted that Tehran no longer wants the TS's annual Article VII report posted on the OPCW's external server because it finds this year's report judgmental and not purely factual.

¶38. (U) Throughout the discussion, Russia and Iran each maintained their respective hard-line stances, with WEOG delegations leaning more toward Russia in calling for more work to be done, and South Africa and Mexico calling for a positive message that matched previous decisions. Notably, Brazil adopted a conciliatory approach, trying to find compromise and looking for balance between often divergent views.

MEETING WITH CLINGENDAEL OFFICIALS

¶39. (U) Dr. Edwin Bakker, Director of the Clingendael Security and Conflict Programme, and Sico van der Meer, a Fellow with the Programme, called on Amb. Javits and Delrep on November 21 to discuss "The Hague Process." Clingendael plans to use The Hague Process as a forum to exchange ideas on effective multilateralism and to promote non-proliferation. Programs will be organized around specific topics, eventually in venues beyond The Hague, and they are looking at producing a newsletter. Potential partners would include OPCW, the city of The Hague, academic institutions, think tanks, and non-governmental organizations. Amb. Javits said it is a worthy idea and would provide a support network for the OPCW Director-General and other leaders in the field. Bakker noted that they hope to pursue UNSCR 1540, disarmament, and other topics, as well as non-proliferation, but want to start with a core group of dedicated organizations. Amb. Javits provided them with the DVD from the Symposium he organized in 2007 at Columbia University and lists of potential NGOs, think tanks and universities to include in their network.

¶40. (U) Bakker also thanked Amb. Javits for his willingness to participate in a Clingendael luncheon and comment on his experiences at the OPCW. (Del comment: the event was posted as a lecture on non-proliferation without Amb. Javits' concurrence; we have since walked it back to the original description presented by Amb. Lak of reflections on his time at OPCW). Bakker also confirmed that the 1540 workshop planned for December at Clingendael will now be in March 2009.

MEETING WITH TS ON VIS AND EDNA

¶41. (U) On November 18, VCI representatives Lisa Von Colln, Rose Ann McHenry and Dean Otey, and DQrep met with the Secretariat team responsible for development and implementation of the Verification Information System (VIS) and the Electronic Declarations Tool for National Authorities (EDNA). The meeting was scheduled in order to resolve several long-standing concerns and questions about data import/export issues for the VIS and share information related to the beta-release of EDNA (to be formally released at the upcoming National Authorities meeting). The Secretariat also provided additional information on development projects and strategies for future development work, and introduced Stephen Wade (Head, Declarations Branch) as the new VIS project manager following the departure of Per Runn (Head, Policy Review Branch) at the end of the year.

¶42. (U) Per Runn and his team answered a number of technical questions related to data compatibility between the OPCW and U.S. database and described the electronic data recently distributed to States Parties, which will be used to populate the U.S. database and treaty data repository. Runn also elaborated on TS plans for future creation and distribution of CDs containing electronic declarations data.

¶43. (U) The group discussed the viability of convening a data experts' working group that could foster discussions related to common data processing issues, and would also facilitate configuration management as related to the declarations database and the State Party declarations tool (EDNA). Runn and Wade indicated interest in establishing such a group, and proposed that this group might meet annually, in conjunction with the National Authorities meeting.

¶44. (U) Runn shared his view that the VIS project still enjoys good support from OPCW management, and has received high marks from in-house data users in the Verification Division. The development efforts have now shifted toward a chemical weapons tracking tool, and the possible addition of modules for old and abandoned chemical weapons as well. The TS team is continuing work on selection of industry sites for inspection, inspection reporting, and mission planning; all of these modules are intended for internal Secretariat use only. U.S. data management experts indicated that there was some interest by States Parties in having a discussion on the Secretariat's site selection algorithm.

Q28TH OPCW DATA VALIDATION GROUP MEETING

¶45. (U) U.S. experts from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Hugh Gregg and Armando Alcaraz participated in the November 18-19 OPCW Data Validation Group meeting. Members of the group reviewed data submitted by various laboratories, and

accepted 84 Mass Spectrometry spectra and 34 Gas Chromatography (Retention Index) values for inclusion in the OPCW Central Analytical Database (OCAD). The Secretariat reported to the group that data accepted by the 27th meeting of the Validation Group was approved by the Executive Council and will be incorporated in the next release of the database (e-OCAD v.9).

¶46. (U) The group continued discussions of development of the LC/MS database for inclusion in the OCAD. Martin Soderstrom summarized efforts to date and agreed to lead a subcommittee in further exploration of the issue. The Mass Spectrometry group also approved the removal of 24 ion trap spectra from the OCAD, as well as 13 poor quality spectra for which alternate data now exists. Sten-Ake Fredriksson (Sweden) was elected coordinator of the Mass Spectrometry sub-group, and Sarah Chinn (U.S.) was elected as a new member of the NMR sub-group, following Robert Maxwell's departure. The next meeting of the Validation Group has been tentatively scheduled for March 3-4, 2009.

SAB TEMPORARY WORKING GROUP ON SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS

¶47. (U) On November 20-21, Robin Black chaired the third meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board Temporary Working Group on Sampling and Analysis, attended by U.S. representative Armando Alcaraz.

Black opened by reviewing the paragraphs of the Second Review Conference that refer to sampling and analysis. The Secretariat then shared its experience to date in the use of sampling and analysis on Schedule 2 inspections. In the TS view, one of the biggest issues that has arisen so far is the time required to complete analyses; current efforts to decrease the time required are focused on improving instrumental software and using auto samplers for GC-MS analysis. The TS is also working on constructing a database for Schedule 2 process chemistry to more readily predict and identify process impurities; developing procedures for crude quantification of these impurities; and developing software that could allow access to a commercial library from the blinded mode to more easily resolve apparent matches with the OPCW Central Analytical Database.

¶48. (U) The Working Group also discussed possible sampling and analysis for future Schedule 3 inspections. The OPCW currently has limited capabilities to analyze certain Schedule 3 chemicals, particularly those that are highly volatile or too reactive to pass through a gas chromatograph. VERIFIN and Spiez Laboratory are already working on some of these more difficult analytes, and may present information on this work at the next meeting of the Temporary Working Group. The OPCW Laboratory is in the process of procuring two FTIR instruments for rapid screening of compounds not readily analyzed with GC-MS. As there is currently no validated procedure for analyzing for perfluoroisobutene (PFIB), the group also discussed two possible analytical approaches for this particular compound. Qanalytical approaches for this particular compound.

¶49. (U) The Temporary Working Group reaffirmed its recommendation that spectra for certain non-scheduled chemicals should be added to the OCAD to facilitate verification for investigations of alleged use, challenge inspections, and old and abandoned chemical weapons. A copy of a report on amiton degradation products was provided to assist the Working Group in its future consideration of the addition of such products to the OCAD.

¶50. (U) The group also discussed additional techniques for on-site analysis, including Fast GC and solid phase microextraction (SPME). For the processing of aqueous solutions, the group discussed hollow-fiber liquid phase microextraction (HF-LPME) and single drop microextraction (SDME), agreeing that HF-LPME seemed to be the most promising.

¶51. (U) On the subject of off-site analysis, Working Group members expressed views on the relevance of trace analysis, which ranged from assessing the relevance as low to regarding it as high for investigations of alleged use. Members agreed that it is not appropriate at this time to test laboratory capabilities in this regard. On biomedical sampling, the OPCW still hopes to hold its first Confidence Building Exercise in mid-2009. A proposal has been made to use synthetic urine spiked with nerve agent and mustard metabolites (high and low concentrations of each).

¶52. (U) Laboratories were also asked to respond to questionnaires on toxin analysis (saxitoxin and ricin), the outcome of which will be used, together with identification criteria already adopted elsewhere, to formulate requirements for the OPCW. The Working Group has asked two laboratories to make recommendations on methods/criteria for on- and off-site identification of these two toxins for the next meeting. In October 2009, several laboratories will be participating in a ricin analysis exercise for the

Global Health Security Action Group, the results of which will be made available to the Working Group. It was also noted that the OPCW designated laboratory network should also be able to analyze for other toxins, particularly for investigations of alleged use.

[¶53.](#) (U) Javits sends.
CULBERTSON